

1. Broadband caps will stunt innovation and ultimately prefer data from within the vendors "cloud", meaning ultimate control of data presentation. IE Time Warner institutes a 100 GB cap, but doesn't count the cap against proprietary Time Warner data like VOIP, on demand videos, or other materials that are dependent upon Time Warners bundles. This will also force more bundling, further reducing per service competition.
2. Broadband for everyone is not possible, however for remote areas the most likely way to get the last mile would be via wireless (wimax, 3/4G, etc). With current fibre pricing, it would just cost too much and the cost would be ultimately be shifted to the consumer through higher bills or via a nasty tax like the universal service charge which is an outrage, because that also subsidizes dinosaur business models (like wired telephone) which should be gone.

If allowing such a gamble, then to spur competition one must allow service providers EQUAL access to this infrastructure to compete, even if an entrenched telco like Verizon owns the lines. In fact it is ultimately in the best interest for the government to own the fibre, and let the taps and service be deregulated to spur innovation and competition.

Great example: My DirecTV. Their service is STELLAR, and an independent dealer performs all maintenance and installation while directv owns the terminals. I can choose who to use for repairs, and even choose to have a maintenance contract w/ directv if I choose. I have enormous hdef channels, the latest DVR, and they still maintain my old mpeg2 tivos which are 6 years old. Time Warner has very limited local content, still broadcasts "analog over digital" and has a very limited selection of hdef, and at a HIGHER price than directv. So we can choose the directv way (competition, local service providers, price) or Time Warner (low technology, low service, high prices, no choice in service).

The competition in automotive service has heated up also. No longer are dealerships (the incumbent) the sole place to receive service and good parts (OEM or 3rd party). It is critical for this to be successful that we allow local service providers to manage/maintain this infrastructure. It will allow small businesses to compete and

keep the regulated monopolies on their feet.

As we saw with the waves of failed CLECs, there has to be a way to capture customers in case of a failure to assist in service interruption. This already works in my home state NY where I am free to choose my suppliers for gas and electric. This is specifically advantageous because in NY customers who use alternate suppliers get relief from certain taxes levied on say those who use the utility.

The system is not perfect and is not Transparent on rates and contracts, and this would have to be in place for broadband to be successful.

Time Warners failed plan to "get the best of both worlds" - charge a high monthly fee regardless of usage, and then impose a cap/fee for "abnormal" usage is the type of hypocrisy we should want to avoid if we want to remain competitive with the rest of the world. We are already behind in so many ways, why cripple the US citizens who invented the internet.

It is simple: The markets that have the most competition and choice always have the best innovation, pricing, and customer service. That ultimately benefits BOTH the consumer and economy, because weak or inefficient companies are driven out or forced to innovate and the consumer has a wide variety and choice, along with competitive service offerings.

Fios is coming to my neighborhood in 2 weeks, and guess what a Time Warner person was actually walking the streets to see how my service was, and if I needed anything. Well guess what if there were no Fios or Verizon DSL, my phone call for service would go to some remote call center with broken english, and someone would get around to it in a month or so during a work day and a window of 9-5.

I DO REMEMBER THOSE days when Bell Atlantic ruled the roost. Service was horrible (though reliable --think regulation) and the prices were sky high with little innovation. They thought caller ID was real innovation. C'mon their switches had that data for decades,

and lets charge \$10/month for it. Disgusting.

Things are so much better today, lets not go back.